DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 363 SP 012 416

AUTHOR Finch, Mary Ellen
TITLE The Teacher and Educational Change: The Decision to Participate and Produce.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 67p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Case Studies; *Decision Making; *Instructional Innovation; Participant Involvement; Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

This report describes the experiences of four junior high school teachers who engaged in the education change process. Further, it analyzes reasons as well as consequences of their decision to participate in the development and implementation of an innovative program. Using the methodology of participant observation, including observation, interviews, and direct participation, the author obtained data that suggests that teachers become involved in educational change for highly pragmatic as well as ideological reasons. Implications and recommendations for teachers and administrators are offered. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151363

THE TEACHER AND EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

The Decision to Participate and Produce

Paper Presented to

American Educational Research Association

Toronto, 1978

Printed in U.S.A.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Ellen Finch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Mary Ellen Finch
Maryville College
St. Louis, Missouri

SP012 416

INTRODUCTION

The reasons for teachers becoming involved in the development and implementation of an educational innovation are often complex. Such reasons as well as the actual implementation of the project by the teachers have been little explored in the literature of change. Gross et. al. (1971) for example, describe the Cambire teachers as expressing the conviction that "there was a great need for educational change in ghetto schools" as one reason for electing to try the "catalytic role model." Further, he stresses that "without exception, all indicated that new approaches were required if teachers were to motivate ghetto children." (p. 80) One Cambire teacher appeared to summarize the feelings of the entire staff:

> There is a great need to try new ways;
> since the traditional isn't working,
> new ways are needed to improve learning.
> (p. 82)

Gross and his associates focused upon the actual implementation, by the teachers, of the aforementioned "catalytic role model." The degree of implementation of the innovation was examined from two perspectives: "1) the quantity of time teachers devoted to trying to implement the new role model and, 2) the quality of their performance during this period of time." (p. 91) In other words, Gross et. al. examined not only why the teachers became involved in the innovation. They also concentrated upon the decisions the teachers made to produce or implement the innovation introduced by the administration at the Cambire School. In actuality, the authors found that the innovation was not implemented by the teachers. According to Gross and his associates:

> Our findings showed that the failure
> to implement the innovation was attributable essentially to a number of
> obstacles that the teachers encountered
> when they attempted to carry it out
> which were never removed. (p. 196)

Reynolds (1973), in the study of the implementation of a differentiated staffing model at Stormy Heights Elementary School, describes yet a different story:

> While our information is not firm on events during this period, it appears that the principal of Stormy Heights had "sensed" the sentiment of his staff and decided to offer his school as the demonstration site. There had been no occasion for discussion or vote among the Stormy Heights teachers concerning their participation. From the teachers' perspective, the selection had been precipitous...Following the announcement, teachers unenthusiastic about the program were given the opportunity to transfer to another school, but virtually none did. Generally, the teachers were favorably disposed toward being part of an exciting and innovative experiment that promised a wealth of educational advantages to pupils...In any event, teachers who were still uncertain were encouraged by the principal to stay and try it out. (p. 77)

Reynolds, further, divides his analysis of the change process into two parts: the pre-implementation phase and the implementation phase. According to the author:

> The implementation phase began when the staff was expected to behave in a manner consistent with the means identified to attain the goals of the proposed program. (p. 137)

In other words, not only does Reynolds examine the reasons why the teachers decided to participate in the Stormy Heights differentiated staffing program, He also focuses, in some detail, upon the teachers' decisions to produce within, or implement, the new program and the problems which were encountered during this implementation phase due to decisions made earlier in the pre-implementation phase of the innovation.

The commitment to open education and to developing an "important educational alternative within the public schools" was the rationale for a group of young teachers who became involved in a project described by Roland Barth in Open Education and the American School. As Barth describes it:

> These seven young educators entered the project well aware that there would be great difficulties; aware of being young, white, inexperienced, liberal and from out of town in a world of older, mostly conservative and cautious adults. Despite these ominous conditions, the five men and two women were buoyed by the Director's support for their ideas; by the instructional coordinator's position as a leader in curriculum, teacher training and classroom supervision; and by what looked like an excellent opportunity to put their ideas into practice in an urban school setting. As one of them put it, "All the lights lit up." Each looked forward to participating in the development of an important educational alternative in the public schools. All were hopeful and confident....Although short on experience, they were long on ability, energy, confidence and idealism. They dared believe radically different things about children, learning and knowledge; they were now prepared to act on their beliefs. (p. 110)

The problems and ultimate defeat these young teachers encountered in attempting to "open up" an inner city elementary school are documented in Barth's brief case study. It is enough to indicate here that enthusiasm and belief in what they were doing were not enough to counter the resistence they encountered as they worked within and attempted to implement the open classroom concept.

In another study of educational change, Smith and Keith (1971)

describe the Kensington School as:

> a unique architectural structure with open-space laboratory suites, an instructional materials center and a theater designed in what might be described as the square lines of Classical Greek simplicity. The program exemplified the new elementary education of team teaching, individualized instruction and multi-age grouping. A broad strategy of innovation-the alternative of grandeur, the utilizing of temporary systems and minimal prior commitments - was devised and implemented. The intended outcome was pupil development toward maturity - a self-directed, internally motivated, and productive competence (p. v)

Describing the teachers selected for such a school, Smith and Keith state that:

> The data suggest strongly...that each faculty member held his own view or schema of Kensington. Typically, each schema seemed to be generated out of special needs and goals, early conversations about the school..and early documents. (p. 35)

and:

> Another thing that I am struck with...is the degree to which these people...are excited by the kind of thing that they are doing in education...there is an excitement about teaching and about the things that they are going to be trying, even though they are not very specific and clear about this yet. (p. 57)

As in the studies of Gross et. al., Reynolds, and Barth, Smith and Keith spent some time analyzing how the teachers actually worked at implementing the ideas upon which the Kensington School was organized. Problems they encountered which influenced their thoughts and actions during the implementation process are discussed and anlyzed. The reasons why the teachers participated in the innovative school and, especially, how they participated, therefore, form a significant part of the study.

Teachers discussed in these four case studies, it appears, made the decision to participate in innovative educational programs because they were committed either to the philosophy behind the new program or approach or excited about becoming involved in an endeavor which might provide new ways to improve the learning of students. However, in the cases of the Stormy Heights teachers explicated by Reynolds and the Cambire teachers described by Gross et. al., because the entire school adopted the innovation, individual teachers were permitted but two choices: join the group or leave the school. In the cases discussed by Smith and Keith and Barth, the teachers who were selected were either just entering the professional and had never taught before or were experienced and were obviously leaving something behind in order to participate in the new program.

We have seen, therefore, that being "committed to educational change" and to improving the learning of children are often given as reasons teachers become involved in classroom or school innovation. However, it is quite possible and, perhaps, probable, that other reasons for deciding to participate may be present as well. Leaving a familiar and, usually, comfortable mode of operating for an untried and often untested program or method requires more, we suggest, than being interested in improving children's learning. This may be and, hopefully, is a major reason. However, as we found in the present case study, there are often other reasons as well.

The study upon which the present paper is based speaks to the need, as Lortie (1975) suggests, for "empirical studies of teaching work and the outlook of those who staff the schools." (vii) The focus is on four teachers as they attempt to influence the development of an innovative program for eighth

and ninth grade students. The case study from which this paper is drawn describes and analyzes the activities of these junior high school teachers as they worked together and shared responsibility for the education of 140 eighth and ninth grade students through the development and implementation of an optional education program, The Optional Education Experience or OEE. It is a study of the early planning of the program, through the weeks of implementation, until the end of the year. Although the planning process involved students, the study focuses primarily upon the four teachers who became involved in the program development and implementation. It is, in reality, a study from behind the teachers' desks.

Three major questions are focused upon within the paper:

1. Why did these four teachers become involved in developing an innovation in the middle of the school year or, why did the teachers choose to participate in the project?
2. How did the teachers actually work or produce within the program?
3. What implications might be extracted from the findings which might be useful in future attempts by teachers to become involved in the educational change process?

METHODOLOGY

In order to understand as fully as possible the nature of the program, that of four teachers (with a group of students) developing and then implementing an innovative program within a traditional school setting, the method of participant observation was selected as the most fruitful approach. The author, further, adopted the position of observer-as-participant.[1] A number of qualitative researchers (Denzin, 1970: Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Zelditch, 1969; Smith and Pohland, 1969) have suggested that a blend of participant observation techniques be utilized in order to have somewhat independent

---

[1] See Junker, 1960, for an extended discussion of both participant observation and the roles the researcher might adopt under this particular methodology.

measures of a particular phenomenon under study. In order to obtain as much information as possible about a "whole human system and its setting" (Diesing, 1971), the author elected to utilize a variety of participant observation techniques as suggested by the above methodologists: direct observation, the interview (formal and informal), documentary evidence, and participant observation. According to McCall and Simmons (1969), "multiple methods are typically and to some degree necessarily involved in a field study of any complex social organization." (p. 8) The development and implementation of a new program exemplifies just such a complex social organization.

In the role of observer-as-participant the author was initially involved with one teacher, Beth Prophet, and the Planning Class of 26 students as they began to create the foundation of the new innovative program. When the three additional teachers had been selected for the new program, in February, the observer concentrated the major portion of her time on team meetings of the four teachers as well as the classes the teachers were teaching. With the arrival of the March 18 opening of the new program, the author's full time commitment was within the team area--in and out of all the rooms, the halls and the teachers' lounge. The author literally "lived" in the team area, observing, talking with students, teachers and administrators formally and informally, performing "much needed functions" such as making coffee, chauffering team members to various destinations, accompanying the team on field trips, drinking beer with teachers, and, on occasion, "subbing" for a teacher who was otherwise engaged. Essentially, the author spent five days a week, many of those days in after school meetings and night sessions, from January through June, in an attempt to capture the essence of the process of developing and implementing a new program.

THE SETTING AND THE ACTORS

Chute Junior High School is one of two such schools in the community of Brookfield. The building, like many built in the 1930's, is of the proverbial red brick, two story "egg crate" variety. Although in the 1960's a flurry of "tear down the walls" ideas hit Brookfield, Chute escaped and the building today is very much like it was when it was built except for a newer wing constructed some twenty years ago which contains several rooms which are joined by sliding doors thus permitting, when deemed desirable by the teachers occupying those rooms, large and small group instruction as well as instruction of the more "traditional" nature.

The OEE was housed within four rooms on the second floor of the newer wing. Two of the rooms were physically separated from the others, one just down the hall a few steps and the other down the hall and around a corner. The two interconnected rooms (divided by the sliding door) provided a "homey" atmosphere utilizing a couch and chairs as well as boxes (creatively outfitted as study carrels) and the usual desks and tables. The other two rooms retained the more traditional appearance of the rest of the building except for Mr. Tate's passion for plants which encouraged him to blanket the windowsills of his room with pots of all sizes and shapes and, in addition, a lovely, multicolored canary which took up residence about April in Mr. Tate's room - - a gift of one of the girls.

This four room setting had been, until mid-March, simply a traditional group of classrooms housing four teachers. With the beginning of the fourth quarter at Chute, the new program consisting of 140 students and four teachers moved into the area thus "taking it over" for their team locale. It is this setting which was the scene for the major portion of the study.

The major characters in the study include:

Beth Prophet:	Teacher of the Planning Class Team leader A teacher of five years' experience
John Boone:	Principal of Chute Junior High School
Lenny Young:	Assistant principal of Chute Junior High School
Sam Rivers:	Social studies teacher on the team A teacher of six years' experience
Toni Beech:	Science teacher on the team A teacher of 2 years' experience-in her first year at Chute
Carl Tate:	Math teacher on the team First year teacher

THE DECISION TO PARTICIPATE AND PRODUCE

A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

March and Simon (1959) argue that there are two different types of decisions made by employees regarding their relationship to the organization "The first is the decision to partcipate - or leave. The second is the decision to produce." (p. 48) For March and Simon, the decision to produce is "substantially different" from the decision to participate.

A Theory of Motivation to Participate

According to March and Simon:

> The decision to participate lies at the core of the theory of what Barnard (1938) and Simon (1947) have called "organizational equilibrium" - the conditions of survival of an organization. Equilibrium reflects the organization's success in arranging payments to its participants adequate to motivate their continued participation. (p. 83)

The Barnard-Simon theory of organizational equilibrium, according to March and Simon is:

> Essentially a theory of motivation, a statement of the conditions under which an organization can induce its members to continue their participation and hence assure organizational survival. (p. 84)

While the theory is highly general and appropriate to any and all organizations, an understanding of its major points may shed some insights into the reasons why teachers decide to become involved in educational change. The following points are essential to an understanding of the theory as it will be utilized in the present paper:

1) An organization is a system of interrelated social behaviors of a number of persons (participants) in an organization.

2) Each participant (and group of participants) receives from the organization inducements (payments) in return for which he makes contributions to the organization.

3) Each participant will continue participating only so long as the inducements are as great or greater, measured by his values and his alternatives, than the contributions he is asked to make.

4) The contributions provided by individuals and groups are the source from which the organization manufactures the inducements offered to participants.

5) The organization is "solvent" and will continue in existence only so long as contributions are sufficient to provide inducements in large enough measure to draw forth contributions. (p. 84)

According to March and Simon, inducements are payments made by or through the organization to its participants. They can be measured in units independent of their utility to participants and for each individual participant we can specify a set of inducements which represent a different dimension of the inducements offered by the organization. Contributions, on the other hand, are payments to the organization by the participants. They, too, can be measured in units that are independent of their utility to the participant. Therefore, for any individual participant, a set of contributions can be specified.

March and Simon indicate that:

> A reasonable definition of the utility of a contribution is the value of the alternatives that an individual foregoes in order to make the contribution... To estimate the inducement - contribution utility balance directly, the most logical type of measure is some varient of individual satisfaction (with the job etc.) (p. 85)

To March and Simon it appears reasonable to assume that the greater the difference there is between inducements and contributions the greater will be individual satisfaction. However, the "zero points" of the satisfaction scale and of the inducements - contribution utility balance are not necessarily identical. For March and Simon, the zero point on the satisfaction scale is the point at which the participant begins to talk of degrees of dissatisfaction rather than degrees of satisfaction. It is:

> Closely related to the levels of aspiration and is the point at which we would predict a substantial increase in search behavior. (p. 86)

The zero point on the inducement-contribution utility scale, however, is the point at which the individual is indifferent to leaving an organization. March and Simon indicate that they have evidence that the two zero points are not the same but:

> That very few of the "satisfied" participants leave an organization whereas some, but typically not all of the "unsatisfied" participants leave. (p. 86)

In other words, according to March and Simon, a worker (teacher, for example,) who feels he is giving (contributing) more to the organization (his class, his preparations etc.) than he is receiving in inducements (pay, smaller class size, "better" students) is likely to feel "dissatisfied" and, perhaps engage in search behavior. The more dissatisfied the worker feels, the closer to the "zero point" on the satisfaction scale, the more likely it is that he will engage in search behavior for different and better and more satisfactory

opportunities. On the other hand, when the worker feels that there is a balance (the zero point) between his contribution to the organization and what the organization contributes or pays to him, he may or he may not decide to engage in search behavior for another job opportunity.

March and Simon state that these differences can be explained primarily by the ways alternatives to current activity enter into the situation. Dissatisfaction, they stress, is a cue for search behavior. A dissatisfied organism expands its search behavior for available alternatives and if, eventually, the search fails the aspiration level is revised downward. The change in aspiration level is assumed to occur slowly but when fewer and poorer alternatives are perceived to be available, the utility of activities which have been passed up decreases and adjustment rapidly occurs. Therefore, the satisfaction expressed by the individual can be used as a measurement of the inducement-contribution utility balance only if it is used in conjunction with an estimate of perceived alternatives available.

> Roughly speaking, only the desire to move enters into judgements of satisfaction; desire to move plus the perceived ease of movement enters into the inducement - contribution utility measure. (p. 86)

To summarize the above discussion explicating the Bernard-Simon theory of organizational equilibrium and set the stage for relating the theory to teachers' decision to participate in an innovative program, the following points should be stressed:

1) Increases in the balance of inducement utilities over contribution utilities decrease the likelihood that the individual will leave the organization, while decreases in that balance have the opposite effect.

2) The inducements-contributions balance is a function of:

   a) The perceived desirability of leaving the organization and,
   b) The perceived ease of movement from the organization.

March and Simon list a number of factors which affect the perceived desirability of movement from the organization (ie. traditional teaching arrangements). The primary factor, according to the authors, influencing employee motivation, is the individual's satisfaction with his job. The greater his satisfaction, therefore, the less the perceived desirability of movement. This satisfaction with the job is further delineated into a number of major propositions, eight of which are salient for our discussion.

1) The greater the conformity of the job characteristics to the self-characterization held by the individual, the higher the level of satisfaction. The greater the disparity the more inclined is the desire to escape the situation. Three types of evaluation of one's self are mentioned as significant: estimates of one's independence, estimates of one's worth, and estimates of one's specialized competence or interests.

2) The greater the predictability of instrumental relationships on the job, the higher the level of satisfaction.

3) The greater the compatibility of work requirements with the requirements of other roles, the higher the level of satisfaction.

4) The greater the consistency of supervisory practices with employee independence the less the conflict between job characteristics and individual self-interest. For example, if an individual desires greater independence in decision-making and supervisory practices are more authoritarian, the greater the pressure to withdraw.

5) The larger amount of reward either in money or status the less the conflict between the job and the individual's self image.

6) The greater the individual's participation in the job assignment the less the conflict between the job and his self image. An individual assigned according to personal preference, for example, will have a more favorable inducements-contribution balance than an employee not so assigned.

7) The greater the congruence of work time patterns with those of other roles, the greater the compatibility of the job and the other roles.

8) The smaller the size of the work group the greater the compatibility of organizational and other roles. (pp. 94-99)

Not only do March and Simon discuss the factors influencing an organizational participant to participate in an organization (or program). They also spend a considerable amount of space on factors which influence the

participant to produce within the organization. Recognizing the difference between the "motivation to produce" and "productivity" within a given organization, they indicate that, "at the moment, psychological research is primarily directed toward 'motivation to produce' rather than 'productivity'." It is, therefore, the former concept which we now discuss.

A Theory of Influence: The Motivation to Produce

According to March and Simon, an individual may be influenced to produce within an organization by:

> (a) changing the values associated with given states of affairs, (b) changing the perceived consequences of an alternative of action, and (c) changing the set of states of affairs that are evoked...Correspondingly, empirical studies of individual motivations to produce have tended to identify (a) factors relating to goals of individuals, (b) factors relating to the expectations of consequences, and (c) factors relating to the set of alternatives perceived at the moment of decision... (p. 52: Emphasis: MEF)

The authors summarize the above three modes of influence in the following proposition:

> Motivation to produce is a function of the character of the evoked set of alternatives, the perceived consequences of evoked alternatives, and the individual goals in terms of which the alternatives are evaluated. (p. 53)

March und Simon consider a variety of "cues" which influence the behavior alternatives selected by the organizational participant not only in his decision to participate in an organization but also in his behavior on the job. Five types of "cues" are discussed: 1) the world outside the organization (or available options to staying within the organization), cues from the formal organizational hierarchy, both intended and unintended (ie. closeness of supervision, participation in decision-making), 3) cues from the task itself

(ie. its complexity), 4) cues from the "officially prescribed work rewards" and, 5) cues from the associates with whom the employee works (ie. norms and standards). Of particular interest in the present paper in the authors' hypothesis related to the fourth cue - "officially prescribed work rewards". According to March and Simon:

> the probability that the evoked set of alternatives will include innovations is a function of the type of incentive scheme used. Innovation is most likely to occur where incentives are tied directly to innovation, next most likely under a system of company-wide incentives; least likely under a system linked to individual productivity. (p. 56)

The authors make the point that individual incentives induce greater individual effort since they are tied to individual activities. However, unless they are tied directly to innovative activities, they do not elicit behavior that requires more than minor changes. According to March and Simon, "The award system is an attention-centering cue that in one case defines a broad organizational framework and in the other a narrower individual one." (p. 56) The issue of reward and innovation, as related to teachers will be discussed more fully in a later section of this paper.

Another "cue", that of the work group and its relationship to the decision to produce, also appears significant to the present study. The factor of individual members providing cues or standards for each other will be discussed further also.

Following a discussion of the "cues" which influence the behavior alternatives selected by the organizational participant in his decision to produce within the organization, March and Simon analyze the types of information utilized by participants in forming expectations about the consequences of the alternative behaviors they have chosen. Four main types of information may

be utilized: the external state of the environment (especially potential alternatives), characteristics of the individual himself, pressures coming from the sub-groups within the organization and how these influence the individual's expectations of the consequences of his production and, finally the reward system which also influences the individual's production choices and the expectations of the consequences of those choices.

The first type of information, external environmental states and possible alternatives to the present work situation, has already been discussed, both in the present section and in the preceding section on the decision to participate. According to March and Simon, the more alternatives the worker feels he has to his present situation, the less important to him the demands made upon him to produce. If he doesn't want to do the work, there are other alternatives he can explore.

Further, March and Simon indicate that the number of perceived alternatives is also a function of the characteristics of the individual himself. For example, how visable he is to other organizations and programs as well as how visable he is to other organizations and programs to him may narrow or widen his range of choices of action. In addition, how inclined he is to seek out other alternatives as well as the degree to which he is specialized or presents other desirable characteristics also influences the number of possible alternatives open to his present work situation.

The third factor, group pressures, is indicated by March and Simon as most frequently affecting productivity decisions by participants within an organization. For example, according to the authors:

> Employees receive physical and emotional sustenance from groups other than the authority figures in the organization and important consequences of their actions are controlled by subgroups within the organization or groups external to it. (p. 59)

The impact of small work groups on the motivations of individuals is well documented in the sociological and psychological literature and is acknowledged by March and Simon. The authors have suggested a number of factors influencing the decision to produce which are associated with groups and individuals ranging from identification with the group (ie. the strength of group pressures upon the worker) to group cohesiveness (ie. the more cohesive the group, the more willing the members to enforce group demands on individuals). These factors or the lack of them, are also salient to our later analysis of the team of teachers in the Optional Education Experience Program.

In addition to the factors of external environmental states, individual characteristics, and group pressures and their relationship to one's productivity, March and Simon examine organizational rewards and their influence on the productivity of the organizational participant. According to the authors:

> The state of the environment and the activities of suborganizational and extra-organizational groups are only partially controlled by the organization. Yet the influence they exert on perceived consequences is large. As a result, recent American students of organizational behavior have tended to relegate the explicit reward schemes of management to the background in order to examine some of the other factors we have discussed. However, a model of man that does not give a prominent place to economic incentives is, for most humans, a poor model. (p. 61)

Organizational incentive systems discussed by March and Simon include not only wage and salary programs (as well as "fringe benefits"), but also various types of promotional systems. Although March and Simon recognize that rewards have different importance for different people, their discussion appears relevant mainly to business organizations. Rewards teachers might receive such as smaller class size, "better" students or more planning time (better working

conditions?) are not mentioned. The idea of increased monetary rewards discussed by March and Simon is seldom tied to "productivity" in teaching, mainly, perhaps, because the concept of "productivity" in working with children has been difficult to define.

Finally, after discussing the "cues" which help determine what set of behavior alternatives will be selected by the organizational participant as he decides whether or not, or how much, to produce in an organization, and the perceived consequences of the alternatives which have been selected, March and Simon discuss individual goals and "particularly the phenomenon of identification". (p. 65) According to the authors:

> Humans, in contrast to machines, evaluate their own positions in relation to the value of others and come to accept others' goals as their own. In addition, individual members of an organization come to it with a prior structure of preferences - a personality if you like-on the basis of which they make decisions while in the organization. Thus, individual goals are not "given" for the organization, but can be varied both through recruitment procedures and through organizational practices. (p. 65)

Four principal types of identification are analyzed by March and Simon as influencing the individual in his decision and actions as he works with the organization:

> 1) organizations external to the focal organization
> 2) the focal organization itself (organizational identification),
> 3) the work activities involved in the job (task identification), and
> 4) sub-groups within the focal organization (sub-group identification). (p. 65)

Further, the authors propose five basic hypotheses pertaining to the individual's relationship to the group and his propensity to produce within the organization or program:

1) The greater the perceived prestige of the group, the stronger the propensity of an individual to identify with it and vice versa.
2) The greater the extent to which goals are perceived as shared among members of a group, the stronger the propensity of the individual to identify with the group and vice versa.

3) The more frequent the interaction between an individual and the members of a group, the stronger the propensity of the individual to identify with the group and vice versa.
4) The greater the number of individual needs satisfied in the group, the stronger the propensity of the individual to identify with the group and vice versa.
5) The less the amount of competition between the members of a group and an individual, the stronger the propensity of the individual to identify with the group, and vice versa. (p. 65,6)

Not only do March and Simon specify five basic variables which affect and are affected by identification with a group and which may affect the individual's productivity on the job. They also present factors which affect the five variables such as the distinctiveness of the group, its visability, the status level of its members and the amount of success the group has in gaining goals to influence its position in the organization at large In addition, the group standards regarding prestige and the prestige level of individual experience influence the individual standards of prestige which, in turn, influence the perceived prestige of the group. All of these factors, of course, influence the individual's relationship to the group of which he is a part and, in turn, influence how and why he produces the way he does on the job.

The interaction between the individual and the group is also considered by March and Simon as significant in influencing how the worker identifies with the group and produces within the organization. Factors determining the frequency of interaction are exposure to contact, pressure to participate in the group, size of the group and, finally, the homogenity of background of the participants. This latter factor, in addition, increases the possibility that group goals will be perceived as shared. Similarity of positions (ie. all <u>teachers</u>, all <u>English</u> teachers, all new to the innovation), in addition, increases the possibility that the group will perceive its goals as shared.

March and Simon also indicate that one variable, permissiveness toward individual goal achievement, increases the number of individual needs satisfied in the group. Another, the independence of individual rewards, if somewhat great, will elicit less competition among group members. All of these variables of "groupness", it should be remembered, are suggested by March and Simon as influencing how the individual produces and works within the organizational environment.

Finally, March and Simon relate the productivity of the organizational participant to his identification with extraorganizational groups (professional associations, community groups, family groups, trade unions), identification with the organization, identification with task groups within the organization. According to the authors:

> Individual goals as they affect the individual's motivation to produce reflect both the strength of his identification with available groups (including the organization) and the direction of group pressures. They also reflect basic values derived from earlier experience. Our justification for emphasizing identification at length rather than what might be called personality factors rests on two basic considerations. First, although identification is influenced by many other factors in the organization, the more basic attitudes we call personality are less malleable. Second, those basic values that impinge on the motivation to produce require "interpretation" before they become relevant to a specific organizational situation and interpretation depends in large part on the phenomena we have discussed. (p. 81)

Following the presentation and analysis of the reasons why the four teachers in the present study chose to participate in the new program as well as a discussion of how they actually implemented or produced once the program began, we will return to March and Simon in order to test the fit of the theory of motivation and the theory of influence with our own analysis of the motivation to participate and produce.

THE MOTIVATION TO PARTICIPATE AND TO PRODUCE: THE STORY OF FOUR TEACHERS

A February 5 meeting was convened by Beth Prophet, the team leader, to inform the additional three teachers of the problems she had been having with the administration as she worked with the Planning Class to develop the new program. The purpose of this meeting was to obtain support from her future team members for confronting the administration with a request for the resources and organizational arrangements which she felt were necessary for developing a successful program. The meeting served to test the interest and desire of the three additional teachers in becoming involved in the new program. Yet in spite of the severe problems which Beth Prophet documented and in spite of the fact that the teachers "won" very few concessions from Lenny Young in the February 7 meeting, three of the four teachers made the decision to participat in the new program and the fourth, Beth Prophet, made the decision to continue.

At least three critical questions must be raised at this point. These are necessary to guide the analysis of the data and to explain the decision made by each of these four teachers to participate in the development of the program in the face of the difficulties which they and the administration knew about.

1) Why was this decision made by the teachers? What were their reasons for deciding to go ahead with the program in the face of such problems?

2) What were the consequences of their decision to participate? How did they actually implement or produce in the new program?

3) How do we understand and explain their decisions and actions in more theoretical terms?

These questions provide the focus for the remainder of the paper.

Carl Tate: Getting and "blowing" a second chance

Carl Tate, the mathematics teacher, elected to participate in the Optional Education Experience program because the idea of a more flexible program for

eighth and ninth graders was appealing to him philosophically, because he was experiencing difficulties in his present classroom, and because he felt the administration, in selecting him, was giving him a second chance.

Tate's initial training was in business rather than in education. His only prior experience with teaching had been with pre-school youngsters in a Head Start program. At the time of the present study he was enrolled in a teacher certification program in a local college to formally prepare him for a teaching career. Further, he was experiencing difficulties in his present classroom, severe enough that his mathematics department colleagues felt he was "foolish" for considering entering the new program.

However, Carl Tate felt that the administration was, in effect, giving him a vote of confidence that he had the potential to become an effective teacher. The data suggest two factors which supported his view. In the first place, although his teaching evaluation had indicated that the administration hoped that being in the new program would not "encourage him to go off the deep end or let his classes become more unruly", Tate mentioned that it had been, essentially, a positive one. He felt that although his problems were recognized, the administration was willing to let him participate in the new program, only cautioning him to be aware of his problems with discipline. In the second place, Tate felt that in selecting him over another mathematics teacher (in breaking the tie vote), the administration was giving him support. In spite of his problems, therefore, Carl Tate was convinced that the administration of the building was giving him another chance.

Many of Carl Tate's problems alluded to by the administration in his evaluation were the result of two factors: 1) the problem of inexperience compounded by 2) a strong sense of idealism and "true belief" concerning children and the teaching process. Both of these factors contributed to his decision to participate in the new program. They also compounded his difficulties once the new program began.

The problems of inexperience, naivete and true belief

Smith and Keith (1971) relate that although the "man on the street" or the "practical man" all seem to "utilize a concept such as 'experience' when they think about their organizations" (p. 112) social scientists have not made much use of the term. At Kensington, however, according to Smith and Keith, "it loomed large." (Ibid.) The problem of experience, or the lack of it, loomed large at Chute also.

On February 27, Carl Tate invited the observer to visit his classroom in order to suggest "feedback" regarding his discipline problems. A basic problem he acknowledged, was that he was not "authoritarian". The field notes illustrate Tate's mode of teaching on that day, telling the students they would be working on areas in which they were weak yet allowing them to select their own area of interest without any help in diagnosis. Further, by the end of the period, the class was literally in shambles with the teacher out in the hall talking.

The analysis suggests that while Tate actually did believe in individualized instruction in the classroom and encouraging the students to work in areas in which they were weak, he did not know how to accomplish the task. He appeared to feel, that by verbally announcing to the students that they should "choose an area and get to work", they would do it. However, Tate appeared unwilling or unable to follow through and help the students in the diagnostic process and then find the materials to work with.

In actuality, this type of teaching is exceedingly difficult to accomplish. It places great demands upon a teachers time, abilities and resources to facilitate that type of teaching; further, he lacked the experience needed to know how "to be all places at the same time" in working with eighth and ninth graders. As he stepped out of the room, or stopped to talk with one student, the entire room appeared to erupt into talking and shouting. In reaction, Tate became angry and a vicious circle was started.

Complicating this problem was Tate's strong philosophical commitment to making the teaching of mathematics more "relevant" to his students. He was convinced that junior high school mathematics (and junior high school in general) concentrated far too heavily on the "content" of a subject as opposed to the "process" of learning it:

> Kids don't see how everything relates to their lives..(we must) teach kids how to think.. (Field notes: 2/27)

He received support in these views from his instructors in the education courses he was taking at City College and he appeared to be constantly testing his views and beliefs against those of his colleagues at lunch and, when possible, in the all day team meetings.

Yet in attempting to put his philosophical beliefs into practice in his own classroom, Tate ran into the difficulty of not knowing how to operationalize the ideas which he espoused. In moving into the Optional Education Experience program, he felt, he would be working with a group of students who might be better able to work in an individualized manner and he would, he felt, have a chance to start over and attempt to practice what he believed in.

> With the time and energy I put in now with no feedback, anything's better... (Field notes: 2/13/)

Consequences of Tate's decision to participate

Smith and Keith describe the Kensington administration as hiring young, inexperienced teachers, at least in part because they "did not want old solutions to educational problems" and because they felt that "it would be easier to train inexperienced personnel in new approaches than to retrain experienced persons." (p. 113) The data analysis of our study suggests that the assistant principal, Lenny Young felt much the same way as the Kensington administrators. He informed the Planning Class students to obtain teachers who could "grow with the program". The analysis suggests further, that both Young and the building principal had, at various times, indicated that they would be working with

the teachers in the OEE. However, our analysis indicates that not only did Carl Tate experience a great deal of difficulty once the OEE began in March, he did not receive any help from the administration either in teaching skills or the materials which he so badly lacked.

The dichotomy of belief and practice

Not only were the Planning Class students, generally, upset about Carl Tate's selection to the program because he was not presently teaching algebra and geometry (and expressed his own concern about his ability to teach those subjects). Following a February 21 student/teacher planning meeting, they also became concerned that he favored a more structured program than they envisioned. Further, a student Evaluation group continually discussed the Carl Tate "problem":

> He doesn't understand the OEE..he makes us be quiet all the time and doesn't get involved with students... (Field notes: 4/16)
> ..math classes no different..won't let people move around much... (Interviews: 4/4)

The data analysis indicates that while Tate verbalized the necessity of getting students involved in the "real world" and making the content "relevant", he appeared to dichotomize what the students would learn with how they would learn it. Although he was committed to the use of learning packets in mathematics, he lacked the knowledge of basic routines and management skills necessary to utilize this methdology. The analysis suggests, therefore, that when the students expressed a desire to work together, to question what they were doing or to become restless or more talkative, he became dogmatic and highly structured in his classes. His inability to find the appropriate materials for the students further increased his anxiety. He fluctuated between verbalizing a desire for being open and wanting the students to learn how to learn, and to lecturing them to "get to work" and taking a "hard line" about working in his classroom.

The need to sort out beliefs

The data indicates that Tate readily admitted, over lunch and in after school meetings, that his own educational needs and beliefs were being sorted out and that he was groping for how to interpret his teaching role. At one point, shortly after the OEE began, he confessed to the observer that he might be happier as a counselor working in a one-to-one relationship with students. The analysis suggests strongly that Tate did not want to be authoritarian in his teaching role; however, he did not know how to structure his classes so that he would not have to behave as a disciplinarian.

End of the year interviews indicate that Tate had not yet sorted out his beliefs. On the one hand, he was disillusioned about the open education concept upon which the OEE was predicated; on the other hand, however, he was even more further convinced that students should be involved in "active doing projects" as opposed to the more conceptual work he had planned. According to Tate, "we should listen more to Piaget". (6/12)

To summarize, the data analysis suggests that Carl Tate, the mathematics teacher in the present study, chose to participate in the new program because he was dissatisfied with his present teaching situation because he was not experiencing success. He was unable to operationalize the beliefs that he held regarding the teaching/learning process and felt that the new program, with people of like minds and based on the philosophy that he believed, would enable him to begin again and practice the idea of students being engaged more fully in their own learning. Although while not feeling adequate in his present situation and seeing the OEE as the most viable alternative for him to follow, we have also seen that he did feel and express some basic concerns about participating in the program although these were, for the most part based upon his inability to teach a particular kind of content.[2]

---

2 Of all the concerns expressed about Carl Tate by the Evaluation group, his lack of ability in algebra and geometry was not one of them. In the long run, Tate's problems were more with process than content.

According to Smith and Keith;

> These factors (inexperience, true belief) interacted to produce problems in the classroom and eroded some of the original confidence and enthusiasm; frustration, anxiety, and discouragement increased. (p. 114)

The data analysis indicates that the same was true for Carl Tate. However, in spite of their frustration and discouragement, Smith and Keith indicate that the Kensington teachers still continued their faith in the basic principles of the doctrine upon which Kensington was built. For Carl Tate this was only partly true. Although he still, as the end of the year interview demonstrates, believed that students should be more involved in concrete, active learning (re: Piaget), he was not convinced that students could be motivated to engage in that activity:

> I can't say I am looking forward to next year.. we need kids who are motivated and spread it to others.(Interview: 6/12)

The data analysis strongly indicates that for Carl Tate, deciding to participate in the new program had not been the answer to his problems.

Toni Beech: Victim-and Victimizer

Toni Beech, the science teacher, like Carl Tate, had been experiencing difficulties in her present teaching situation. Although both teachers lacked adequate preparation in their content areas, Beech's problems vis-a-vis her subject matter were by far the more severe.

The problem of poor subject preparation: Muddling through

Toni Beech had been trained as an elementary school physical education teacher. Finding herself within a junior high school science department peopled by teachers whose backgrounds were heavily science, she felt out of place and ill-equipped to teach the subjects assigned to her. Three aspects of the job were especially difficult due to her poor background: knowing what to teach,

or the content itself, the inability to utilize her preferred teaching style because of her poor content background, and a problem with curriculum writing which appeared to be an inevitable outgrowth of her lack of science preparation. These three difficulties, in turn, led to her virtual exclusion by the science department as a member of the group.

Content and process problems

Toni Beech drew a cause and effect relationship between her lack of content preparation and the necessity for her to lecture to her students rather than move freely among them, helping them with projects as she preferred. Further, as she told the observer, her present students were unable (intellectually, she inferred) to work individually. Therefore, she was looking forward to becoming involved with the OEE where students "will want to work individually."

On March 6, at her invitation, the observer visited Toni Beech's classroom. The field notes confirm Beech's concern about poor subject matter preparation:

> Toni sits at her desk to take attendance and go over a puzzle she gave them yesterday. Five students leave the room with permission to work in the library. She indicates todays topic is the digestive system and asks "how many of you know what the digestive system is?" - seemingly meaning, what is its function? She gets an answer and then begins naming off the parts, stopping briefly to ask if they know what the gastrointestinal tract is..no answers. She tells them about the process of "breaking down food"...only about four kids appear to be paying attention. The rest are talking or reading...now she is going into the respiratory system and is side tracked (?) by a question about plants' breathing. Tells them Vitamin D comes from sunlight... she is now on pigmentation of skin and what sun does to Black people...now she switches to vitamins. Frankly, I'm lost and from the looks on the kids' faces they are too. It's a free ranging discussion but somewhere a while back she left the digestive system and the rest of us... (Field notes: 3/6)

Not only was Toni Beech not prepared in her content area by formal training. At least in the lessons observed on March 6 she also was unprepared for the classes she was teaching due to not doing her "homework." She implied, in a March 4 interview, that she was forced to lecture because of her poor background, being unable to carry on a class discussion adequately. The March 6 field notes confirmed her inability to carry on a discussion adequately in a given topic in science; further, she chose on this day not to lecture thus drawing attention to her excessively poor preparation, both the formal, academic aspect and that of preparation for a particular day's lesson. However, although she was the victim of a job assignment for which she had not been adequately trained, her students were the victims of teaching which was inadequate and often incorrect.

Curriculum writing problems

Compounding her problems with teaching were the science department's weekly meetings which focused on the development of curriculum, In late February Toni informed the observer that she was having problems with her department chairman, Mr. Brush, because she and her student curriculum helper were having trouble writing curriculum. According to Toni Beech: "He keeps rejecting everything we turn in."

Although she was acutely aware of her poor preparation in science, talked about it and lamented the difficulties she was experiencing because of it, nowhere in the data is there evidence that Toni Beech attempted to compensate for her poor background by extra preparation. Rather, the data analysis suggests that she complained while muddling through her classes and the curriculum writing as well. The decision to participate in the new program appeared, according to her comments, a way to improve on her present, difficult situation in the science department.

Complicating factors: making a difficult situation more difficult

We have suggested that Toni Beech chose to become involved in the new program mainly because she was experiencing severe difficulties in her present situation due to her lack of an adequate science background. Not only did the lack of a science background push her into the program, it also caused problems for her once she was in the new program. Several additional factors converged to further complicate the situation.

In the first place, Toni Beech was the only science teacher in the building who had expressed interest in joining the new program. As a result, the Planning Class students decided there was no point in interviewing her as they did with the rest of the teachers. Therefore, she was not subjected to the questions and discussions with the students which might have given her some insight and information as to the expectations the students held for the new program. She was able, therefore, to plan her part in the program based on her own ideas totally. Those ideas, unfortunately, did not coincide with the plans of the Planning Class.

In the second place, the "science curriculum student", the Planning Class student whose task it was to convey to Toni the ideas the students had for science coursework in the new program, did NOT convey this information to her. Instead in their meeting, she allowed Toni to TELL her what she planned to do and then did not react in such a way to indicate that these plans were not compatible with those drawn up by the Planning Class students.

A third problem was Toni Beech's lack of time and, possibly, commitment, to the new program due to her family complications. She was divorced and attempting to raise a daughter alone. Major problems due to her daughter's continuing bout of colds, flu and other illness were further aggravated by automobile problems which forced her to arrive at school later than usual on several occassions and leave meetings early on others.

Finally, Toni Beech was assigned the room "down the hall and around the corner" referred to earlier in the paper. This room became hers because it contained counter tops and water, two factors useful and, perhaps, necessary, for science teaching. However, the location of the room prevented her from interacting routinely with other members of the team and prevented her total involvement in the program.

In summary, Toni Beech decided to participate in the OEE because of problems in her present teaching situation. These problems were the result of her inadequacy in the teaching of science. However, additional factors, just mentioned, worked to make her entrance into the program difficult and to prevent her effectiveness once the new program actually began.

"Bowing out gracefully"

In early May, Beth Prophet asked Toni Beech to leave the program at the end of the year. The June 9 interview with the observer conveyed Toni's reaction to this request:

> (I) didn't quite understand why Beth came in...didn't really understand I would be going back to the regular program...Joannie (a friend) told me to bow out gracefully... (Interview: 6/9/)

Shortly after the program began in March, it became clear to the students, as well as to Beth Prophet, that Toni Beech was experiencing trouble in her science classroom. Field notes from March 26 and March 29 illustrate that she was unprepared to teach in the individualized manner which the students desired, that she did not know how to develop the "packets" which were expected by the majority of the students and that, in addition, she had no time to prepare in order to keep a step ahead of her students. The students themselves, in April, were criticizing their science teacher because they were unable to obtain the help from her they needed:

> That's one of our biggest problems...can't just "do" chemistry..need someone who knows something and Mrs. Beech doesn't, that's for sure... (Field notes: 4/25)

By the end of the year, although Toni Beech had agreed to leave the program, to "bow out gracefully", the field notes suggest she was exceedingly bitter. The data suggest that she felt that she had entered the program with a number of misconceptions:

> I thought I'd get more self-directed kids... 'the cream of the crop' (Interview: 6/9)

and that she had been left to survive on her own:

> The whole year has been disgusting...these kids seem more critical...when you do have an idea no one follows through. The OEE is even worse that I had before..the administration basically dumps the teachers on their own..those four days (of team planning) were still distracted...not much help in resources... which I could have seen some packets...I literally went in blind. (Ibid.)

Although Beth Prophet, as team leader, was quite aware that Toni Beech was experiencing problems getting organized and meeting the expectations of the students who desired an individualized curriculum, her attempts to improve the situation did little to actually help Toni. On the one hand, she spent some time at a March after-school meeting talking about how she developed "packets". However, the data indicate that the following day Toni informed the observer that she still did not understand the packet concept and her students were still unhappy with the way she structured her assignment.

On the other hand, however, Beth Prophet "covered" for Toni rather than stressing to Lenny Young that the science teacher was floundering and needed more help than she could receive from her teammates. Although she did report to Young that Toni was having problems, she insisted that they should give the science teacher more time, that she would work with her and that"certainly things would improve". In essence, the team, but especially Beth, "covered" for Toni until late April when student dissatisfaction became so great that Beth indicated to Young that Toni would have to be removed and another science teacher added to the team for the coming year. Rather than helping Toni Beech by her

"protection", Beth's method of approaching the problem only served to aggravate the situation. Conversations recorded by the observer throughout this time period indicate that Beth felt torn in her desire to help Toni yet, at the same time, concerned as to the type of education the students were receiving in the science classes. The situation clearly was difficult for all involved, including the students.

In addition, Toni Beech felt herself to be in a "no-win" or "double bind" situation:

> Team meetings were based on problems...not HOW to teach...(we) really should have gotten a plan..didn't enjoy my teaching role...looked for things to do with the kids...didn't think about getting help from the team because they weren't in my field but the last place I'd go was the science department because that would have admitted failure. (Ibid.)

Toni Beech did not know where to go for help. While feeling that the team meetings should have been more helpful, stressing how to teach rather than spending time talking about students' problems, she made it clear in this interview that she did not feel her teammates could help her because they were not in her field. It is possible that her inability to "translate" Beth Prophet's concept of packets to her own field of science after the March meeting reinforced her feeling that she needed help from people in her own teaching field.

However, she was equally adament about not going to her own department for help. Although she had approached her department chairman soon after the program began for the loan of science materials[3], he made it clear that anything she borrowed would be quite temporary. Going back to her department for curriculum help would have meant again admitting failure. This she was unwilling to do.

---

[3] Although Beth had announced during the first day of planning that a limited amount of money was available for resources, Toni Beech had not requested materials for her classes. Therefore, she entered her room on March 18 with no science materials and was forced to ask for some on loan from the science department.

In summary, Toni Beech's problems were extreme. Although three of the teachers experienced difficulty, only Toni's were severe enough to result in her removal from the program. We have seen that she carried problems into the program with her which, when complicated by a number of factors after the program started, made her survival nearly impossible.

School district "mistakes": The consequences

We have stressed throughout this section on Toni Beech that she was employed by the Brookfield School System to teach a subject for which she was only minimally qualified. Further complicating a difficult situation was the decision of the Chute administration to place her or allow her to join in an innovative program where, on the one hand she would be free of the pressures of the science department, but on the other, forced to utilize a subject matter she did not possess to work individually with students. Lenny Young had stressed that "teachers who can grow with the program" were desired. It is possible that he felt removing Beech from her present pressures would, indeed, allow her to "grow" as a teacher. Our data analysis suggests, however, that Toni Beech was incapable of "growing" because she simply did not know what she was doing in the first place.

While it is intriguing, at a theoretical level, to speculate about "school district mistakes" - the employment and placement of teaching personnel in positions for which they are not qualified and the resulting consequences of such mistakes - the damage in most situations is likely to be severe. Not only did Toni Beech leave the program embittered; many OEE students indicated in their June interviews that they felt an entire year of science had been wasted. Certainly Brookfield is not the first nor the only school district to engage in such a practice. The consequences of such practices, however, are yet another part of the unstudied lives of teachers in schools.

Sam Rivers: Background of a true believer

While we have suggested that Carl Tate and Toni Beech decided to participate in the OEE because they were attempting to "escape" situations in their present classrooms which were unpleasant or unrewarding, our analysis of the data suggests that this was not the case with Sam Rivers. Rather, he appears, at least in part, to exemplify the "true believer" as described by Hoffer (1951):

> They must have the feeling that by the possession of some potent doctrine, infallible leader or some new techniques, they have access to a source of irresistible power. They must also have an extravagant conception of the prospects and potentialities of the future. Finally, they must be wholly ignorant of the difficulties involved in their vast undertaking. (p. 20)

According to Smith and Keith (1971):

> True believers come for many reasons. Some seem to have a relatively simple faith in working toward educational ideals that they hold sincerely and uncomplicatedly. Others perceive, quite clearly and consciously, the possibilities of combining their faith and their careers. Others seem to be searching for identity and a positive self-concept, as Klapp suggests. (p. 115)

The data suggest that at varying times during the course of our study, Sam Rivers decided to participate in the Optional Education Experience program for all the reasons mentioned above by Smith and Keith.

"A simple faith"

Sam Rivers held an educational philosophy involving students and teachers which he felt unable to practice effectively operating alone in his social studies classroom. Over a beer one early February afternoon, Rivers spun out his ideas for the OEE:

> (I am) somewhat influenced by Skinner...there's a need to control the kids' environment...the open classroom will set up an environment more conducive to learning...(I am) concerned that kids are inconsistently treated during the

> school day...(I) see things happening more deliberately, more predictable...more probable outcomes..better product. Teachers need to work together..need for a team approach... (Informal conversation: 2/9)

Lortie (1975) writes of the "autonomy-equality" role of teachers where preference is given for operating alone in one's own classroom, each teacher considering himself the equal of his peers. Although Lortie found this pattern to be widespread among the teachers he studied, Sam Rivers verbalized just the opposite position. In his view:

> I like working with others..sharing and planning. The best ideas come from working with others...not that way in my department. I felt constrained... (Ibid.)

Rivers felt his entrance into the OEE would enable him to be part of a "team" effort to work more effectively with students. He was particularly concerned that teachers work together in order to plan a learning environment where students would know what was expected of them (more predictable environment) and would not have, for example, multiple homework assignments all at once:

> Teachers don't work together to assign.. unfair to students...need to work together... (Ibid)

Of all the teachers involved in the OEE, Sam Rivers was the most vocal about working with others in the "sharing-planning" process. At the March 5 all day planning meeting he expressed sincere interest in sharing a book ordered by Beth Prophet. Her suggestion that while she would use it for creative writing, he could use it for psychology topics appealed to him and they spent several minutes discussing how they might contruct "joint" assignments.

On the afternoon of February 26 the four teachers toured the team area to determine room assignments. The two large rooms which were joining, separated only by a large folding door, were selected by Rivers and Beth Prophet, mainly because they decided that their two subjects were appropriate for team assignments as well as the sharing of films. Both were enthusiastic about the

possibilities of working up "joint" assignments although neither forced the issue during the planning days to create any specific content areas which they might teach or plan together.

At a March 5 meeting when Carl Tate presented his "position" paper on the OEE, Sam indicated his special approval of the statements which read:

> There will be more personal interaction between you, your fellow students and the teacher...
> ...more overlap between social studies, English, math and science...

He reaffirmed his interest in teaming in terms of teaching and planning with his colleagues although, again, making no attempt to work out any plans in advance.

In summary, one of the major reasons given by Sam Rivers for becoming involved in the Optional Education Experience was his desire to work with other teachers in a team situation, sharing the same students, ideas and planning together more deliberately in order to provide a better education for the eighth and ninth graders with whom they would be working.

"Wanting to be freer"

According to Rivers, he was "really interested in change". He wanted to improve the education of his students as well as his own teaching. Another reason given for becoming involved in the OEE was that although he enjoyed his present teaching situation he felt somewhat "constrained" by his departmental colleagues and, especially, his department chairman regarding the content he was expected to teach. On February 9 he stated to the observer:

> Want to do more than under a particular unit ...feel confined by having to do specific topics...want to be freer than in a topic (unit) situation...I'll be freer and happier...want to also improve kids' reading scores and math skills...

Several days following his meeting with the two girls who represented the "social studies curriculum group" of the Planning Class, Rivers commented to the observer

that he was "impressed with the quality of suggestions" they had given to him. He appeared particularly interested in their suggestions for using simulation games and value clarification activities, ideas that had originated from the students who had been in the previous year's seventh grade open education team. He mentioned that it was this sort of creativity that he had been missing within his social studies department and which had not been encouraged by the chairman. Although, he stated, he was aware that some students (ninth graders, in particular) needed to complete topics such as the federal and state constitutions to graduate, he was more interested in encouraging them to study topics "they were interested in".

Although the data suggest that Rivers was very much aware, from meeting with the students, that they expected to study a vast number of topics, selecting those which were of interest to them, and that he was supportive and enthusiastic about working with students in such a mode, it does not indicate that Rivers, at any time in any of the meetings of the team or with the observer, mentioned how he planned to operationalize such plans. Although stressing the need to work together to improve students' reading and math scores and skills and requesting, at the February 26 team meeting that the team consider giving the students pre-tests and post-tests to determine if those skills were improved[4], He did not suggest a method as to how they might procede. Exemplifying Hoffer's "true believer", he appeared to simply believe that the teachers working together in a team approach, a term never defined, and encouraging students to study a number of topics, would produce the results he desired. We suggest that he

---

4 Although the teachers appeared to evince interest in Rivers' idea of pre and post tests, the suggestion "died" after Carl Tate questioned the possibility of any measurable change when they were working with the students for only one quarter.

appeared to hold a somewhat "extravagant conception" of what the teachers and the new program would be able to do, while not being aware of the "difficulties involved" in the process.

A belief in students' abilities

A further example of Rivers' somewhat "simple faith" in the power of the new program to effect change was his strong belief that students should take more initiative in their own work and that this should be a major tenet of the Optional Education Experience program. On February 13 he indicated to his teammates that he liked "having students included in planning". Further, he indicated that his administrative evaluation praised him because:

> I encouraged kids...mentioned on my evaluation as a positive thing... (Field notes: 2/5)

The field notes of March 18, the day the Optional Education Experience began, illustrate Sam Rivers' attempts to put his philosophy into practice:

> When you come into this room, what you do and what you learn is decided by you...

and again on March 20 the field notes capture his comments to the second period group:

> For people in sociology...many have asked - what would I study? I brought a number of books which begin with a description of sociology. Read and see if it stimulates your interest...

The data analysis suggests that Sam Rivers held this faith in the students' abilities to direct their own learning without reservation. Throughout the February 21 afternoon meeting with students, he, alone, was the teacher who assumed a "moderate" stance in encouraging the teachers to allow the students the freedom to move between rooms in the OEE area without passes, to study in the hallways and to leave the building on "outside projects". Rejecting the proposed "structure" of the program which Tate emphasized was necessary, Rivers indicated that his position was that the students could handle the flexibility of the program.

In summary, the data analysis suggests that Sam Rivers appeared to have a "simple faith" that entrance into the new program would not only permit him to improve the learning of students through working with his colleagues in planning and having the freedom to teach what he wanted; it would also permit the students to take more opportunities in initiating their own learning and, that further, they would be able to handle the freedom which they would be given. How this all would be accomplished was a question he did not ask.

"Furthering his career" The teacher as politician

Although, as we have suggested, Sam Rivers appeared to earnestly believe in the philosophy he expounded to his colleagues, he also was keenly aware that he had been "tapped" by the administration to be the social studies teacher in the new program. He indicated to the observer and Beth Prophet at the February 9 informal meeting that both Boone and Young had informed him that he was their "choice" for the program over several other social studies teachers who had indicated interest in the program at the social studies curriculum meeting. They had approached him to ask him not to "withdraw" his indication of interest because they felt he was the best of the candidates in that area. Further, as we have already indicated, he stated in the February 5 meeting that his administrative evaluation had been positive and had encouraged him to continue his method of working with students.

Rivers had indicated in his February 9 meeting with the observer that he "felt constrained in the social studies department" and that his department chairman viewed him as "a rebel". He stated that he had been impressed with Lenny Young's enthusiasm for the program when the two students and Young had visited the social studies curriculum meeting; however, his departmental colleagues had suggested that Young's feelings were obviously "politically expedient" due to the pressure exerted by parents and students over the summer. While

admitting that he was aware of this possibility, Rivers indicated that he wanted to become involved in the new program because he "believed in change" and because he felt it was supported by the administration. At a later date he stated, somewhat ruefully, that Young had even implied that "extra time would be given for planning."

An interesting possibility, suggested by the data analysis, supports our contention that Rivers was engaged in "furthering his career" by entering the Optional Education Experience Program. Sam Rivers was running for office in the Brookfield Teachers' Association at the time the teachers were selected for the new program. He was unable to stay for the entire February 5 meeting because he attended a district-wide meeting of that organization to give a speech accepting his nomination as president-elect. In early March he was selected president of the organization and became immediately involved in the problems of salary negotiation and the district tax campaign. Leaving his room for phone calls and attending meetings was possible because other teachers in the team, at least those adjacent to him, could "cover" his room for short periods of time. A further factor which prevented his classes from being totally disrupted as he engaged in his political pursuits was the presence of several student teachers who could "carry on" under the guidance of Beth Prophet when he was engaged in school district business. It is interesting to speculate if the flexibility for him to carry out his presidential duties would have been possible had he been in a somewhat more traditional, autonomous classroom. In essence, Rivers appeared to find his presence in the OEE more advantageous both to his career as a teacher in the building and in the district at large.

A "con artist" or "searching for a teaching identity"?

Interviews with students on April 5 indicate the following comments on Rivers' teaching:

> In social studies (he) says...you've got your topic, go study it...That's too broad...

> We get to make choices-do things on our own...there's much freedom (within a content area) but also a problem of knowing what to do...it took me over a week in social...
> (Student Interviews: 4/5)

Although Sam Rivers held an educational philosophy to which he expressed strong commitment, he appeared unable to operationalize it once the OEE became a reality. In spite of verbalizing the desire to provide a more "predictable environment" for the student, in reality he created a situation in his classroom where the students were confused because he gave them too much initiative or freedom without any direction.

A colleague who was spending time in the Chute building on another assignment and with whom the observer, one day, discussed Rivers' obvious difficulties in the classroom, suggested that Rivers was, in reality, a "con-artist", "conning" not only the administration and Beth Prophet with his continual pronouncements of how he wanted to work with students, but also himself. Support for this theory is certainly available in the data. Throughout the period of the OEE he appeared to be expounding on the desire to give students freedom and allow them to develop their own interest, while not actively working to improve his method of interacting with them. In mid-March he asked his students to list the "hurts" and the "helps" operating in the OEE. When the list stressed that "students need more concrete help" and that "some teachers won't give help and kids have to do it themselves" he confided to the observer that he was aware of this situation. However, the data indicate that he did not, after the list was discussed, change his behavior nor did he appear to spend time attempting to develop alternative teaching methods to work with his students, although one of his student teachers began, at that point, to develop learning packets and

spent after-school time with Beth Prophet learning how to write objectives and activities for these teaching methods.

It is possible that Sam Rivers was "conning" the participants in the program, and himself as well. Although verbalizing profoundly an individualized philosophy for students and acknowledging, further, that students were having problems in operationalizing the philosophy by themselves, he seemingly made no attempt to change. Further, he allowed his student teacher to, essentially, "do the work". He spent a great deal of time out of his classroom on district teacher association business as opposed to being in the team area with his students and colleagues. While talking a "good game", he appeared to be less than willing to expend the energy necessary to do an effective job.

On the other hand, it is possible that Sam Rivers was honestly searching for his own "teaching identity", for the way to operationalize his philosophy. Although he had taught for five years, and had even spent a year at the university in curriculum development, it is possible to suggest, based on what he said as well as his inability to operate effectively, that he was unable to operationalize his philosophy because he did not know how. In an end of the year interview with the observer, Rivers commented:

> (I should have) exercised more leadership with the kids in the early stages...it would have been possible then though at some point the idea of individual kids pursuing their own interests made it difficult to exercise a role as a leader...sorry I didn't have more time to develop packets...feel positive about them... for the kids least able, to be able to give them something and say, try this...my packets will be terrific next year... (Interview: 6/6)

The differences between Sam Rivers, Carl Tate, and Toni Beech, at the end of the year are striking. Rivers appears to exemplify the "true believer" teachers described by Smith and Keith in that he was waiting for "next year" and did not allow his frustrations and disappointments to interfere with his commitment to

the beliefs he held for the program. However, as we have attempted to suggest, wrapping Sam Rivers up into a neatly tied package which reads "true believer" based on a "simple faith" in the philosophy of the program is likely to explain his behavior and words only partially. More than the other teachers who became involved in the Optional Education Experience, Rivers exemplifys the complexity of the decision making process when teachers elect to become involved in new, possibly better and certainly unknown endeavors.

Beth Prophet: teacher and team leader: Getting "sucked" in

Of the four teachers involved in the new program, Beth Prophet was the one who was best able to implement her own philosophy. Prior to becoming involved in the Planning Class, Prophet had not only believed in encouraging students to learn at their own pace and select the topics they desired to study. She also had been teaching in this mode in her own classroom. Becoming involved in the Optional Education Experience was, for Beth, simply an extension of what she was already doing. Further, by her position as Planning Class teacher, she was able to shape the expectations of the 26 students to the model she intended to utilize. While the data indicate that the "shaping" was not made explicit, not even to herself, it occurred nonetheless.

Knowing how to do "it": teaching

Because she had been teaching in this mode, both in her English classes and, to a degree, in the Planning Class, she had thought through her philosophy of "students working independently" and "operating at their own pace". Therefore, she was able, during the beginning days of the program, to work actively with her students to implement the mode.

In addition, of all the teachers in the OEE, the students recognized that

Beth Prophet "could do it." Informal interviews illustrate their satisfaction with her model:

> I like English really well...no one can get started in science or social studies but that's not a problem in English...
>
> Teachers had alot of responsibility pushed off on them... Ms. Prophet knows how to do it...
> Ms. Prophet gives the most guidance...
> (Informal Interviews: 4/5)

To the students, then, knowing how to "do it" consisted of: 1) helping students get started, 2) giving guidance, 3) having materials available for them to choose from. The learning packets which Beth Prophet had developed in her English classes, which she had discussed with the Planning Class and which became, ultimately, the mode of teaching which the students generally came to expect in the program, appeared to fullfill the students' conception of "it." Further, Beth Prophet's own classroom behavior of constantly checking and supporting students as they worked singly or in groups on the packet materials supported their feeling that she "gives guidance" and knows how "to do it."

A problem of roles: Team leader

Beth's decision to participate in both the Planning Class and then the OEE was, in terms of her instructional role, a comfortable one. Unlike Tate and Beech, she was satisfied with her position as an English teacher; however, when the opportunity presented itself of extending her ideal model to an entire program she felt the challenge to become involved. And like Sam Rivers, although not really dissatisfied with her teaching, Beth, in a number of conversations with the observer, stated that she felt little support in the English department for "opening up" her classes and felt she could probably do a better job with students if she could operate totally as she wanted and with the support of the administration. Essentially, therefore, her instructional role was much the same as before. She was comfortable in it and performed it well. She was

reinforced by the students, especially in contrast to the groping of her colleagues. The consequences of her decision to participate were positive and reinforcing for she easily and best exemplified what the OEE seemed to be all about.

However, in her role as team leader, Beth Prophet was less successful. On February 7 the summary notes include the following item:

> Beth informed me that she has been designated team leader by Lenny (last week sometime) and the role apparently bothers her a great deal... (Summary notes: 2/7)

The concept of team leader was new at Chute. Although all departments in the school had departmental chairmen with one released period for ordering materials, equipment and other administrative work, there was no role description existent for Beth Prophet's position. As the only interdepartmental "teaching team" in the school and the only teachers who did not have a built-in planning period, the departmental format did not "fit" the OEE nor did the concept of department chairman "fit" Beth Prophet.

As we have indicated, Lenny Young, in an off-handed way, early in February, informed Beth that she would serve in the team leader capacity for the new program. Although Beth was no doubt a "natural" to become team leader because of her work in the Planning Class and her knowledge of the program, the teachers, at their February 13 planning meeting, did not know that one of them had been given the position. Indeed, Carl Tate in his June interview informed the observer that he had not known for several weeks that they even had a team leader.

The selection of Beth Prophet as team leader by the school administration was probably a "natural decision" because of her work with the Planning Class students. It is unlikely that Lenny Young or John Boone even considered any of the other three teachers for the position. However, school district administrators have been known to make inappropriate personnel decision. A decision

which would seem "natural", "logical" or "expected" (ie. the employment of an acting principal of a building to be principal, the stepping "up" of an assistant superintendent to the superintendency) may be the most expedient or natural, but not in the long run the most effective or responsible decision. In the selection of Beth as team leader, the decision appeared to be based upon her position as the person who "knew" most about the development of the program and not upon a careful consideration of the needs of the position or the skills necessary to operate effectively. Yet from the point of view of everyone involved in the program, including the teachers, the decision was unquestionably the expected or natural one for the administration to make.

However, Beth Prophet's desire to participate in the position of team leader had not been considered. Especially in the weeks prior to the opening of the program in March, she was ambivalent about serving in the leadership role. While recognizing that she was, perhaps, the most logical person to head the group, as she was also the most informed about the directions in which the Planning Class had been moving, she was uncomfortable about being placed in a position where she was expected to assume a leadership capacity vis-a-vis her peers. Having had no experience in such a position and not fully understanding what was expected of the job, she was uncomfortable and unsure of herself in the role.

The Decision to Participate and to Produce: A Reconsideration of Two Theories

A Theory of Motivation to Participate

According to March and Simon, each participant in an organization receives inducements (payments in return for which he makes contributions to the organization.) As long as the payments he receives are as great or greater, based on his value system, than his contributions, he will continue participating in the organization and remain satisfied, or at least neutral. However, when the

participant feels he is receiving less from the organization, again, based on his own value system, than he is contributing, he is likely to become dissatisfied. According to March and Simon, the more dissatisfied the participant feels, the more likely is his engaging in search behavior for a more satisfactory situation. The authors emphasize that the primary factor influencing employee motivation to remain in his present situation is his satisfaction with his job. In addition, March and Simon specify that the participant's perception of available alternatives to his present job is crucial. Although dissatisfaction is a cue for search behavior and a dissatisfied participant will look for available alternatives, if there are few or no such alternatives to this present situation and the search fails, gradually his aspiration level to leave is revised downward. The fewer the alternatives for leaving, therefore, the more rapid the adjustment to the present situation.

According to our data analysis, the decision of the four teachers in our case study to leave their present situations for the new program supports at least in part the Simon-Barnard theory. In the preceding section we suggested that at least two of the teachers in the study, Tate and Beech, were highly dissatisfied with their present situation. Both felt, they stated, that they were giving far more to the organization (both the classroom and the school) than they were receiving in payments from the students, from their departmental colleagues, and from the administration. To them, payments were signified by "feedback," verbal support, a feeling of being "successful" in the classroom. According to Tate, for example:

> Maybe we should go ahead and just make it work. We can't lose no matter what happens. With the time and energy I put in now with no feedback, anything is better. (Field notes, 2/5)

And Toni Beech complained, at the same meeting:

> The administration doesn't support you. It's as if you're fighting someone. When I came here I was told Brookfield was different, but it's not. (Field notes, 2/5)

Therefore, not only were Tate and Beech dissatisfied with their present job. As the theory suggests, because an available opportunity existed in entering the Optional Education Experience, they were able to leave their dissatisfying situations for one which appeared to offer more satisfaction.

While Tate and Beech appear to be examples of organizational participants whose dissatisfaction clearly outbalanced their satisfaction, hitting the "zero point" on the satisfaction scale, Sam Rivers and Beth Prophet represent participants who, while not necessarily dissatisfied with their present position, were not necessarily enthusiastic about it either. They represent what March and Simon call the "zero point" on the inducement-contribution - utility scale, the point where the individual is indifferent to leaving the organization. However, as March and Simon indicate:

> Roughly speaking, only the desire to move enters into judgements of satisfaction; desire to move plus the perceived ease of movement enters into the inducement - contribution utility measure. (p. 86)

We saw in the previous section, that not only was the OEE (and the Planning Class for Prophet) available as an alternative, but also for both Rivers and Prophet the ease of movement was simplified and encouraged by the administration. Sam Rivers was told by both Boone and Young that they wanted him in the program. Beth Prophet was selected by Young to be the Planning Class teacher and then, later, as team leader. Therefore, while not necessarily searching for alternatives to their present position because they were highly dissatisfied, both were encouraged and solicited to become involved by the administration when they expressed interest in the new program.

The theory is even more specific, however, about the factors which affect an individual's satisfaction or disatisfaction with his job and encourage his search behavior. According to March and Simon:

> Three types of evaluation of one's self are mentioned as significant: estimates of one's independence, estimates of one's worth and estimates of one's specialized competence or interest. (p. 95)

While each of these factors are more or less significant to each of the four case studies, several are significant enough to be singled out for brief discussion.

Both Sam Rivers and Beth Prophet support the notion that their "independence" was a factor in deciding to participate in the OEE. Sam talked about wanting to be "freer" than he was in having to teach specific topics or units in the social studies department. He mentioned that he was characterized as a "rebel." Both Rivers and Prophet mentioned that their department chairmen, as well as departmental colleagues did not "approve" of their teaching methods, in Sam's case, being supportive of students, and in Prophet's case, in "opening up her classroom" and using learning packets to individualize instruction. Both appeared to believe that they would have more independence in the new program.

Both Rivers and Prophet, in addition, were interested in giving students more initiative. Prophet, in particular, felt competent in teaching in a style not approved by her English colleagues. Rivers, although verbalizing a belief in encouraging students to do more on their own had not taken the step in his own classroom. Both, however, stressed the desire for more independence and to teach according to their own area of interest or in a manner they felt most competent.

Neither Carl Tate nor Ton Beech were felt by their departments to be particularly competent for their positions. Toni Beech, in particular, we have seen, continually felt "put down" by her department chairman for her inability to effectively work in the science area. In addition, both felt they could do a better job in a different situation. The data suggest that their sense of "self worth," to use a March and Simon concept, had been lowered in their present

positions. They felt a strong need, therefore, to improve their image as a teacher to themselves, to their colleagues and to the administration of the building.

March and Simon further state that the more predictable the "instrumental relationships on the job the higher the level of satisfaction." Although Sam Rivers, more than the other three teachers, verbalized a desire for "predictability" and "more probable outcomes," the data analysis supports the contention that each teacher, in joining the program, hoped that he would be able to teach according to his own philosophy and that the program would be organized more along the lines of what he believed. All appeared to desire a part in structuring the program and the curriculum so that the program would be both predictable and understandable.

"The greater the compatibility of work requirements with the requirements of other roles" as well as "work time patterns" and the "smaller the size of the work group" are also suggested by March and Simon as factors in the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of organizational participants. We have seen that Toni Beech was incapable of writing effective science curriculum, at least according to her science department chairman. By deciding to leave the science department and participate in the OEE, she would not, she thought, be writing curriculum for her colleagues to approve or disapprove. For her, the requirements of curriculum writing (as well as lecturing) were uncomfortable. For Carl Tate and Sam Rivers, being able to participate in a team, a small group of individuals working with the same group of students, towards similar goals, was preferable to being in a large department where each person seemingly went their own way.

However, of the three factors just mentioned, while the analysis suggests that the "size of the group" and the "compatibility of work requirements" were

considered important to the teachers, the concept of the "greater congruence of work time patterns" appeared significant only to Sam Rivers. Each of the teachers entered the program believing he would have released time to plan, both before the program began and during the implementation period itself. We have quoted Sam Rivers as indicating that Lenny Young had made a point of stressing that idea in the social studies departmental meeting. Even after the February 7 meeting when it became evident that there would be no built-in planning periods, however, none of the teachers appeared to realize that an increased work load and far longer hours would be necessary to create and implement the program. Our data suggest that other factors, already cited, were far more important to the teachers who virtually ignored the possibility that their present teaching positions might, in the long run, entail less actual work than being in the OEE.

For Toni Beech, not only was there a "lack of compatibility of work requirements" with her other roles; she also felt that her department chairman oversupervised her and allowed her little flexibility to teach as she felt comfortable. According to March and Simon:

> The greater the consistency of supervisory practices with employee independence, the less the conflict between job characteristics and individual self interest. For example, if an individual desires greater independence in decision-making, and supervisory practices are more authoritarian, the greater the pressure to withdraw. (p. 84)

Deciding to participate in the OEE permitted Toni Beech to escape a departmental situation where she clearly felt she was not wanted, where she felt little freedom, little support, and where her chairman apparently kept close watch on what she was doing. Making the decision to withdraw was not a difficult

one for her.

Further:

> The greater the individual's participation in the job assignment the less the conflict between the job and the self image. An individual assigned according to personal preference, for example, will have a more favorable inducement-contribution balance than an employee not so assigned. (p. 95)

We have indicated that Toni Beech was not teaching a subject in which she was qualified. Had she the job assignment she desired, it would have been in the area of physical education, not science. By electing to participate in the new program, she was exercising more control over her own teaching destiny, although still not in her preferred content area. While she would still be teaching science, it is true, the data suggest that she anticipated that she would be able to teach the subject "her way," a way that was more conducive to her own self-image and her limitations in the area of subject matter.

The factor of the individual (teacher) participating in his own job assignment influenced not only Toni Beech in her decision to participate. It was, perhaps, at the heart of the decision made by each of the four teachers. The analysis suggests that each of the four teachers held an image of himself as "teacher." In their "regular" classrooms each had been assigned a certain number of classes, students and subjects to teach. As in the case with most schools, they had been placed to fill the school's needs, not their own. Whether or not they were teaching the particular subjects or students they desired was not a question in which they played a part in deciding. By opting into the new program each of these teachers, the data suggest, was confident he would be in a job assignment by virtue of his own choice and that the assignment was also more congruent with his own image of himself as a teacher.

Finally, at the time each of the four teachers <u>initially</u> made the decision

to participate in the new program, he assumed the administration was in support of the plan. There was a certain status to being involved in something new and different. Sam Rivers indicated he believed in change while Beth Prophet and Carl Tate believed that eighth and ninth graders should have options to the traditional program. Being involved in an innovation in which they believed philosophically appeared to give the OEE status in their eyes. Even after the February 5 meeting when all the teachers became acutely aware that the program was not being supported by the administration, their own belief that they were creating a better program for students made their entrance into the new program more rewarding, at least for them as teachers, than remaining in their present position.

In summary, our analysis of the four OEE teachers' decisions to participate supports, to a large degree, the Barnard/Simon theory on the decision to participate in an organization. For each of the teachers, entrance into the program either appeared to reduce the dissatisfaction felt with their existing circumstances or, as in the cases of Rivers and Prophet, the availability of the program in addition to the ease of entering encouraged their decision to participate even though they were not experiencing the severe dissatisfaction felt by the other two. In addition, the analysis indicates that each of the four teachers held a view of himself (his self-characterization) which, under his earlier, unsatisfactory position, was discordant with his ideal view. Self-worth, independence, competence, satisfactory relationships on the job, congruity with other roles in their lives, and participation in the selection of one's own position all were factors of greater or lesser degree for each of the four teachers as they considered whether or not to participate in the new program.

As stated earlier in this section, March and Simon suggest that, if

alternatives for movement are not easily available, and if the participant is dissatisfied, he is likely to eventually and then more rapidly, with dwindling alternatives, revise his aspirations for departure downward. March and Simon suggest that the participant will then "adjust" to the unsatisfactory situation. Both Tate and Rivers elected to remain in the OEE for the 1971-72 year rather than return to the "traditional" classroom even though the OEE proved unsatisfactory, especially for Tate, the mathematics teacher. In the case of Tate there was literally no other alternative, other than going back to his previous situation. Searching for another position in another school district would have been difficult as he had not completed teaching certification requirements. Further, the time and energy needed to look for another job were not present during the spring when most teaching positions become available. The alternatives for leaving, therefore, were limited. Thus, the decision to remain was made and, if the March and Simon theory is correct, Tate, especially, was forced to revise his aspirations downward and adjust to remaining in the OEE. Because the observer left the field at the close of the school year, data on Tate the following term is unavailable.

The nature and problems of this adjustment, however, are not dealt with clearly by March and Simon. The motivations and problems of the participant who is forced to remain in a position should certainly be considered in the study of the participation of people in organizations. It is likely that many teachers, today especially, with a limited job market, do not have the option or alternative of leaving an unsatisfactory situation, at least as freely as in previous years. How they adjust and how effectively they subsequently participate in the organization as well as how they feel about their jobs when they must remain in them are questions in need for further study.

Although March and Simon do not deal directly with the problem of adjustment for the individual who must remain within an unsatisfactory situation, their

discussion on the motivation to produce within an organization does offer some clues into the factors which influence the organizational participant to work or produce within that organization. While our present analysis involves participants in their first experience within a new program, prior to any indication that they might want to leave but find their exit impossible, it is possible that an analysis of the factors which influence a participant to produce, or not produce, might offer some ideas as to how the participant must "adjust" or work once he finds his exit from the organization blocked. Although the topic is beyond the scope of the present study, it appears important enough to warrant future research.

The Motivation to Produce

Having made the decision to participate in the development of the Optional Education Experience in spite of obvious odds against its success, the four teachers actually operated or produced in the program quite differently. The data suggest that the motivation to produce within the program by each of the teachers, in addition, was influenced by a variety of factors. Although March and Simon discuss the theory of influence and the motivation to produce extensively, we have elected to isolate those factors of the discussion most relevant to our case study.

March and Simon suggest that a number of "cues" may influence the behavior alternatives of an organizational participant in his decision to produce on the job. We have already indicated that outside alternatives to their present situation, other than going back to the "traditional" classroom, did not exist for the four teachers in the study. However, we do have data which suggest that "outside the organization" factors may have influenced the four teachers in <u>how</u> or <u>how much</u> they participate or produced in the new program. Sam Rivers' participation in the teacher politics, for example, quite likely took time away from attendance at meetings of the team as well as from his classroom

preparation. Carl Tate's coursework at City College reinforced his ideas on innovation and individualization of instruction even while he was experiencing difficulties with discipline. In the former case, the "outside the organization" factor quite likely influenced how much Rivers produced in the program. In the latter, it is possible that how Tate produced was influenced in that he was encouraged to keep innovating although difficulties with his students were almost overwhelming. In the case of Toni Beech, although our data are limited, it is likely that her concerns as a single parent which forced her to miss meetings, arrive at school late and leave early, influenced both the how and how much she produced within the OEE. Similarly, Beth Prophet's extra time for the innovation was quite likely made possible because her husband was in law school and seldom at home, enabling her to spend atypical amounts of time in school. The data suggest, therefore, that "outside the organization" factors quite likely influenced each teacher's motivation to produce or work within the new program, at least in part.[5]

March and Simon also suggest thut "cues from the formal organizational hierarchy" may also influence the behavior alternatives of an organizational participant in his decision to produce on the job. We have seen that both Carl Tate and even Sam Rivers felt supported by the building administrators in their entrance into the new program. It is possible that this "cue" may have influenced Tate to remain with the job and keep working even while experiencing severe difficulties due to his inexperience and lack of skills. Had he not felt at least somewhat supported, even though the support was stated prior to the beginning of the program, it is unlikely that he could have survived given

---

5 The effect of influence of teachers' lives, both inside and outside the classroom and school organization upon their teaching is an unstudied problem in need of future study.

his problems and the strongly negative reactions felt by the students to his teaching and discipline policies.

Cues from the formal organizational hierarchy (i.e., her department chairman) influenced Toni Beech in her decision to leave her regular classroom and enter the OEE. There, she hoped, close supervision of her teaching and curriculum writing would not be present. However, as the June interview data indicates, Beech felt that Beth Prophet also oversupervised her by often walking in and out of the science classroom. The analysis suggests that this cue, as it had in her previous situation, led to dissatisfaction on the job and possibly to an unwillingness to produce and perform effectively in her classroom.

The data suggest that the formal organizational hierarchy (i.e., Young and Boone) in actuality spent little time once the program was under way (or even before) talking with or observing the teachers in the OEE. The teachers were more or less left alone to do their "thing" and the few reinforcing pats which were received were in passing -- in the halls or in the office as the teachers happened by. It appeared to the observer that these cues served mainly to reinforce behaviors which kept the program and the students out of the administrators' hair. The cues were not specific enough nor frequent enough to influence how any of the teachers might produce or behave within the new program. Instead, the cues, particularly the verbal ones, appe.. d directed toward encouraging the teachers to keep doing what they were and not rock the boat.

Innovative behavior, therefore, was not "rewarded" by the building administrators. In fact, as we have suggested, just the opposite might be inferred. As we have seen, although the principal and his assistant seemingly wanted the new program, they were unwilling to free up the resources to insure programmatic success. Further, by their inattention to the program they appeared to suggest that they really did not care how innovative it was, just as long as they weren't bothered by it. March and Simon suggest that rewards may encourage an organizational participant to produce, particularly if the reward is tied directly

to the innovation. There were few, if any, rewards for the teachers participating in the Optional Education Experience -- no released time, no extra resources, no outside administrative help for curriculum development nor, as suggested by March and Simon, no added incentive for overtime work. The teachers' decisions to produce within the new program, therefore, were not based on tangible rewards received. Instead, the data might lead us to suggest that the lack of rewards and administrative interest might have influenced at least several of the teachers to produce even less than they might have even after they made the decision to enter the new program. Toni Beech, in her June interview, inferred as much when she indicated that she had been under the impression that she would be working with especially able and motivated students but found otherwise. Her reaction was that she had been cheated and given incorrect information.

Perhaps the factor upon which March and Simon concentrate most heavily is the influence of the work group upon the individual's decision to produce. Not only does the group influence the worker's choice of behavior alternatives as he decides how or whether to produce in an organization or program. According to the authors, as the worker considers the consequences of the behavior (s) he has chosen, the effects of group pressures (standards, norms) quite heavily determine productivity decisions. Finally, the goals of the individual, and particularly his need to identify with his group are discussed by the authors as crucial to the decision to produce. Therefore, while March and Simon deal with a variety of cues which lead the worker to determine his behavior alternatives, and also which affect his goals on the job, they most heavily emphasize the effect the work group within the organization has on the organizational participant's motivation to produce.

We have quoted the authors as believing that:

> Humans, in contrast to machine, evaluate their own positions in relation to the value of others and come to accept others' goals as their own. (p. 65)

They suggest, therefore, that the individual's relationship to the group affects his tendency to produce within the organzation or program. The perceived prestige of the group, the extent to which goals are perceived as shared, the frequency of the interaction among the individual and the group, the number of needs of the individual satisfied by the group and the amount of competition among members of the group are all suggested as factors which will affect the individual's production as he works within the group.

In March and Simon's terms, the OEE teachers, at least at the beginning of the program, did not effectively constitute a group. Prior to beginning the new program, the teachers met together as a group a total of six times, two of which were for periods of less than two hours. Although the other four sessions were for the entire day, the time was interrupted by guest speakers, meetings with students, and the necessity to handle a multitude of "nitty gritty" details. The four teachers did not have the time or opportunity to form into a cohesive group, one which developed and operated with its own norms and standards. According to the authors, "the more cohesive the group the more willing the group members are to make demands upon the individual" (p. 60). Such a situation, the making of demands by the group upon the individual, did not occur until the year was nearly over. At that point, the three teachers who did appear to become a group, or close to it, by virtue of their proximity to each other geographically, their attendance at after-school meetings and their willingness to share equipment and ideas, joined together to advise Toni Beech that her expectations for student behavior were unacceptable and that she was expected to follow the same rules they did. At the end of th year, in addition,

Beth Prophet, while not consulting with Carl Tate, did discuss the matter of Toni's leaving with Sam Rivers. The appearance of a group was beginning to form, but its influence upon the teachers' motivation to work in the program would not be apparent at least for another year.

Toward a Theory of Participation and Productivity

The various factors discussed by March and Simon as influencing the motivation to produce are clearly important within an organization or program. The selection of behavior alternatives, the consideration of consequences of these choices, and the goals of the participant-worker and his relationship to the group which strongly influences him are all necessary to the consideration of how and why the worker-teacher produces. However, as important as the theory of influence is to the decision to produce, it appears insufficient as a basis for our entire analysis. At least in the case of three of the four teachers in the present study, the decision to produce was additionally influenced and complicated by their lack of understanding of the teaching model to be implemented as well as by a lack of skills, abilities and experiences for teaching that model. Even with the strongest support from the group and the administrative hierarchy, the most effective reward system or any of the other motivational factors discussed by March and Simon, a worker-teacher who simply does not "know how to do it," and who lacks the materials and methods for implementation is going to produce differently and, probably, less effectively and efficiently, than the teacher who has the experience, understnading and skills for the job. Motivation is, therefore, but one of the factors which enables a worker to produce in the organization.

Toni Beech, perhaps, best illustrates the organizational participant whose inability and/or unwillingness to produce was complicated not only by factors from outside the organization (i.e., her home life), the adminstrative hierarchy, and the OEE group itself. Beech's productivity within the Optional Education

Experience program was also influenced by an extreme inability to perform in the classroom due to a severe lack of content knowledge as well as a lack of teaching skills and an understanding of what the entire program was about. The difficulties faced by Carl Tate were caused by the same basic problem.

In effect, it appears that the factors which led the two teachers to participate in the new program, thus escaping an unpleasant situution, led to problems of producing within the new program. Rather than allow them to survive with mediocre skills and a less than satisfactory understanding of the program they were to implement, the demands placed upon them within an innovative effort were far greater. Thus, problems with productivity were emphasized all the more. The reasons for their decision to participate in the OEE appeared to be the very reasons which led them to experience severe problems in the implementation of the program.

Sam Rivers and Beth Prophet, however, were not, essentially, fleeing some kind of difficulty in their present classrooms. Instead, for a variety of reasons, they were drawn to a new mode of operation and innovation. However, it is likely from the data analysis that the attraction of the new activity possibly blinded them to problems which they faced later. Beth Prophet, for example, was unaware of what was involved in being team leader until she had been effectively "sucked in" by the process. And Sam Rivers, in spite of his philosophical commitment to the program's concepts, had little understanding of what was involved in working with students at their own pace, on their own interests.

The ability to produce effectively within an organization, or a program, therefore, appears to be a blend of factors: the motivation to produce, the understanding of the program itself, and the skills necessary to accomplish

the task. The present study suggests, therefore, that for a worker within an organization, especially a teacher innovator, to effectively participate and produce within that organization, he must conduct an intensive analysis of his own skills and understanding of the project as well as of his motivation for deciding to participate before actually becoming involved in a situation in which he finds it impossible to produce. Further research is necessary, however, to determine if the problems of participation and productivity were unique to the four OEE teachers or if, indeed, factors which lead teachers to become involved in a new program also influence their mode of implementing or producing within that program and, further, just what the factors are which influence productivity within an organization or program.

REFERENCES

Barnard, C. I. The functions of the executive (30th anniversary edition). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Barth, R. Open education and the American school. New York: Agatha Press, 1974.

Boone, J. & Associates. Involving students in curriculum building. Paper presented at the meeting of Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development Action Lab. #39, November, 1971.

Charters, W. W., Jr., & Associates. Process of planned change in the school's instructional organization. Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. Eugene: University of Oregon Press, 1973.

Charters, W.W., Jr. Measuring the implementation of differentiated staffing: A comparison of two elementary schools. Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. Eugene: University of Oregon Press, 1973.

Fullan, M. Overview of the innovation process and the user. Interchange, 1972, 3, nos. 2-3.

Gross, N., Giaquinta, J., & Bernstein, M. Implementing organizational innovation. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Hoffer, E. The true believer: Thoughts on the nature of mass movements. (1st ed.). New York: Harper, 1951.

House, E. R. The politics of educational innovation. Berkely: McCutchen Publishing Company, 1974.

Junker, B. Field work: An introduction to the social sciences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Klapp, O. E. Collective search for identity. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1969.

Lortie, D. The teacher and team teaching: Suggestions for long range research. In Shaplin, J., & Olds, H.F., Team teaching. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Lortie, D. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

March, J.G., & Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

McCall, G., & Simmons, J. A. Issues in participant observation: A text and reader. Reading Mass.: Addison - Wesley, 1969.

Olds, H. H. F. A taxonomy for team teaching. In Shaplin, J. T., & Olds, H. F. (Eds.), Team teaching. Evanston, Ill.: Harper and Row, 1964.

Reynolds, L. Problems of implementing organizational change in the elementary school, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1973). University Microfilms No. 73-28, 630.

Sarason, S. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Shaplin, J. T., & Olds, H. F., Jr. Team teaching. Evanston, Ill.: Harper and Row, 1964.

Smith, L. M., & Geoffrey, W. Complexities of an urban classroom. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1978.

Smith, L. M., & Keith, P. Anatomy of an educational innovation: An organizational analysis of an elementary school. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.